

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed May 13, 2008, the Examiner's claim rejections have been considered. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections regarding all pending claims and earnestly solicit allowance of these claims.

1. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claim 46 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as there is insufficient antecedent basis for “the number of full and partial credits.” Claim 46 has been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter thereby traversing the rejection. Claim 46 has also been amended to correct its dependency.

2. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 10-11, 17, 20, 29, 33, 41 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker (U.S. Patent No. 6,113,492) (“Walker ‘492”) and Walker (U.S. Patent No. 6,068,552) (“Walker ‘552”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 20, 33 and 41 are not obvious because Walker ‘492 and Walker ‘552 fail to disclose all the limitations of the claims. These cited references fail to disclose “converting the funds received from the player into credits, wherein each credit has a value less than a smallest denomination for standard currency,” as recited by claim 1; “receiving player input selecting a credit value that is less than a smallest denomination for standard currency,” as recited by claims 20; “the controller configured to determine a number of credits available for play by dividing the value of the voucher by a credit value, the credit value being less than a smallest denomination for standard currency,” as recited by claim 33; and “an input device configured to allow a player to select a credit value; the credit value being less than a smallest denomination for standard currency,” as recited by claim 41.

The Examiner erroneously states in the current Office action that “Walker [‘492] teaches a gaming device that converts the funds received from the player into credits, wherein each credit has the capability of being a value less than a smallest denomination (see col. 9: In

55-67).” The section cited by the Examiner describes a reverse payout table (shown in FIG. 3C of Walker ‘492) and teaches that fractional coin values can be the payout for a given game outcome. For example, Walker ‘492 states at column 9, lines 64-65 that “for a wager of one coin, a payout may total only one sixth of a coin.” (emphasis added). There is no disclosure in Walker ‘492 that the gaming device converts funds received from the player into credits capable of being a value less than a smallest denomination, as recited by the current claims. Further, there is also no disclosure in Walker ‘552 that the gaming device converts funds received from the player into credits capable of being a value less than a smallest denomination. Accordingly, since all the limitations of the current claims are not described or suggested in Walker ‘492 or Walker ‘552, claims 1, 10-11, 17, 20, 29, 33, 41 and 46 are allowable.

3. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 15-16, 23-24, 36, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker ‘492 and Walker ‘552 as applied to claims above, and further in view of Skratulia (U.S. Patent No. 5,690,335).

Applicants note that claims 15-16, 23-24, 36, and 43 are dependent claims that depend from independent claims 1, 20, 33, and 41, respectively. In light of the arguments submitted in Section 2 of this response, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 15-16, 23-24, 36, and 43 are not obvious in view of the combination of Walker ‘492, Walker ‘552, and Skratulia because these references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the claimed limitations. Moreover, these dependent claims further recite and define the claimed invention, and thus, are independently patentable. In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 15-16, 23-24, 36, and 43 have been overcome.

4. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 39 and 48-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker ‘492 and Walker ‘552 as applied to claims above, and further in view of Wilms (U.S. Patent No. 5,277,424).

Applicants note that claims 39 and 48-56 are dependent claims that depend from independent claims 1, 20, 33, and 41. In light of the arguments submitted in Section 2 of this response, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 39 and 48-56 are not obvious in view of the combination of Walker '492, Walker '552 and Wilms because these references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the claimed limitations. Moreover, these dependent claims further recite and define the claimed invention, and thus, are independently patentable. In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 39 and 48-56 have been overcome.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest and *bona fide* effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 10, 11, 15-17, 20, 23, 24, 29, 33, 36, 39, 41, 43, 46 and 48-56 is believed to be in order, and a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fees indicated in the Fee Transmittal, any additional fee(s) or underpayment of fee(s) under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17, or to credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 194293, Deposit Account Name STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (310) 734-3200. The undersigned attorney can normally be reached Monday through Friday from about 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM Pacific Time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 24, 2008

/Douglas R. Peterson/
Douglas R. Peterson
Reg. No. 53,458
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
2121 Avenue of the Stars
Suite 2800``
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel 310.734.3200
Fax 310.734.3300